# THE UNITARIAN.

Vol. I. SEPTEMBER 1, 1834. No. 9.

## *Manufactures in their Influence upon Pauperism.*

### No. IV.

### LARGE MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS.

[Concluded from page 356.]

Land, in our country, will support a much more numerous population than can be usefully employed in its cultivation. How shall the surplus population be employed? In manufacturing raw materials, and fitting them to answer the wants of man. Thus each country village must have its shoemakers, carpenters, spinners, weavers; all of whom are as useful and as necessary as the farmers themselves. The division between manufacturer and agriculturist may not, at first, be distinctly marked. He who ploughs in the spring may make his plough in the winter; and the wife and daughters of the farmer may spin, weave, and make into clothing the wool which he has raised. All these operations are performed at home; and each man acts upon his own responsibility, with his own capital. Machinery is rude and cheap. Gradually this machinery is improved. In consequence of these improvements labour is rendered more productive. Still the same amount of labour can be spared from agriculture, and employed in manufactures. Hence the amount of manufactured articles will be increased. The comforts, conveniences, and elegancies of life are multiplied, we will suppose, ten-fold; that is, the same amount of labour will now produce ten times the former amount of products. How are different members of the community affected? The

same quantity of agricultural products will command in exchange ten times the amount of manufactured articles, which they formerly commanded, and the mechanic, after paying for his raw materials and his food, will have left for his own use ten times as many articles of his own production as before. Thus every improvement in machinery improves the condition of producers and consumers. Such would be the case, if, as before, each man acted upon his own responsibility, employed his own capital, and worked his own materials. But here is the difficulty. Almost every improvement in machinery requires an increase of capital, which renders it generally impossible for labourers to be at the same time proprietors. The whole business, therefore, is taken from their hands into the hands of capitalists, and they are retained only as a part of the machinery. They are not able to purchase machinery, and it is in vain for them to compete with their untiring antagonist. The only possible result would be misery and starvation. They are, therefore, placed under the direction, and at the mercy, of capitalists, who, being few in number and great in power, may combine at pleasure to reduce their wages or increase their tasks, and thus keep to themselves no small part of the comforts and luxuries, which labour-saving machines have introduced. Such is the theory, and as a matter of fact it is so. Labourers are indeed better fed, clothed, and lodged than formerly; but have they a just share in the improvements of the times, and does not the increase of large manufacturing establishments place them more and more under the control of the rich, and render them less and less independent and responsible beings? We despise, as heartily as anyone, the vulgar clamours against aristocracy, whether of riches or talents. But is it not the *tendency* of increasing manufacturing towns to make wide the distinction between employer and employed; to raise up, on the one hand, a class of rich men and invest them with dangerous powers over their fellow-men, and, on the other hand, to raise up a race of beings with hearts and souls educated for the degraded place in which they are born? It is useless to talk about free institutions of government. They have no miraculous influence over a mind which, from its earliest years, has been enslaved to a single manufacturing operation. No law of the land can compel such an one to remain there; but there is a stronger law binding upon him, the law of necessity. He is fit for no other employment. He must either remain there or starve.

And it is idle to reason against this doctrine from the present character of our manufacturing population. They were not bred in factories; but carried to them the independent spirit which they had imbibed at home. The love of knowledge, habits of thought, principles of virtue, which they had acquired in the best of free institutions, their own free homes, have not ceased to act; and now, ere it is gone, we should adopt measures, by which this precious stock of freedom, virtue, and knowledge may be perpetuated.

How is this to be done? Simply by impressing upon the minds both of proprietors and labourers a sense of the importance of education. But this conviction should not be suffered to spend itself in vague and empty wishes. It should have some definite object. The measure which we would propose is this;—that no children under thirteen years of age should be employed in any factory, and that every considerable factory should have a school connected with it, which all the hands between the ages of thirteen and twenty should attend two hours of each day. This, we believe, would effectually remedy the prominent evils that we have pointed out.

Children are already allowed to attend school until twelve or thirteen years old. At Lowell none are received into the factories under thirteen; at Waltham none under fourteen. But this is not sufficient. It is only in a few extraordinary cases, that children of thirteen will have acquired such a taste for intellectual pursuits as to continue their studies amid the hardships of perpetual toil. But if two hours a day should be purposely set apart for this object for seven years longer, we cannot doubt that, in a majority of cases, a decided taste for learning would be acquired. These two hours would be considered hours of recreation, and books would be associated in their minds with the pleasant thoughts of relief from labour. And such would be the love of knowledge, that the scanty moments which the more busy pursuits of after life may allow, will be gladly improved; and the Lord's day instead of being what it now too often is, a day of dissipation, would become a day rich in gifts of moral and religious improvement. It would become a day of rest from bodily toil; but a day of action for the mind and heart. And if all this could be brought about, we would have the system carried yet farther. We would have the hours of labour through life abridged. We would have a portion of each day through life purposely set apart for the cultivation of the mind.

We believe all this practicable; and in order to bring it about, nothing, we believe, is wanting, but a strong conviction of its importance on the part of *the labourers themselves.* "The plan that we sometimes talk of," says an intelligent correspondent who is engaged in manufactures, "we have not been able to accomplish yet, but think that at some future time it may be done. It is to employ an extra number of children to relieve those already employed, so that each one should have an opportunity to receive instruction a portion of every day by a person employed for that purpose.

"At present they seldom get sufficient schooling in consequence of the unwillingness of their parents to lose their services; which they must do if sent to school. Consequently a very small part of the year is devoted to learning."

This, we think, would accord with the experience of most places. The great opposition to all measures of the kind comes from those who are to be benefited by them.

But let us examine the subject more carefully. Can the period ever arrive, when those whose sole employment it now is to supply their bodily wants, who find it hard to gain a daily pittance for themselves and families by the sweat and toil of their own limbs, — can the period ever come when they, having supplied the wants essential to their animal existence, will be able to turn the attention inward, and call forth the hidden treasures which lie there unnoticed and unknown?

Whether such a period will arrive is more than we can tell. Bewildering mists rest upon futurity. But if the friends of learning and humanity manfully put forth their strength, there is no ground for discouragement.

Owing to improvements in science and more especially to the multiplication of labour-saving machines, the same labour which a century ago required ten labourers, may now be performed by one. Of course if the wants of men remain the same, only one tenth of the time then given to labour will now be required. Nine tenths of the time will be left for other pursuits. Men may be in every respect as well provided for as they then were and yet have nine tenths of the time left upon their hands to be employed as they may choose.

How is the fact? With the increase of means, wants have increased. The physical comforts of life have been greatly multiplied and superfluities still more. Hence the labourer is just as much employed as before the improvements were

made. Fashion has led the way by converting superfluities into necessaries, and, meanwhile, the mind, with its growing wants, has been in a great measure overlooked. But suppose that custom, instead of converting luxuries into necessaries, had taken a different course, and made fashionable, and therefore necessary, to have a cultivated taste and a well-informed mind; suppose that she had placed these among the essential requisites of good breeding; we should be supplied with all the comforts which we now have, and instead of the unsatisfying luxuries, which cost such a deal of labour and anxiety, we should have the highest of all luxuries, enlightened souls.

But then the poor labourers would be thrown out of employment! Not at all. Let the same fashion, which reduces (by one sixth for instance) the demand for labour, extend to the labourers themselves, curtail their superfluities in the same ratio, and put it out of their power to work more than five sixths of the time which they have usually given to labour. There will be no excess of labour in the market; the ratio between demand and supply will be the same as before, and workmen will receive five sixths of their former wages; which by the supposition will be sufficient to supply their wants now that they are reduced.

But the measure, which we propose, is more favourable than this. It does not affect the condition of wealthy consumers. Fashion among them will still impose her exhorbitant claims. The demand for labour remains nearly the same, while its supply is diminished. Of course its price will be raised, and the labourer for five sixths of his time will receive very nearly the same compensation which he now receives for it all. He has reclaimed one sixth of his time for mental improvement, and the rich must, out of the abundance of their superfluities pay for it. This would do something to bring down the mountainous inequalities which machinery in its progress would raise. And even the rich are more than repaid for their sacrifices by the improved state of society, which is thus brought about; in the additional security of property which they enjoy; and, above all, in the additional security of morals, by which the lives of their children will be purified and protected.

Let not the measure be sneered at as theoretical and impracticable. The great work is now going on. Gradually and silently it is every year advancing. Individuals and governments more and more feel the necessity of giving a good education to the labouring classes; they are more and

more disposed to act upon the principle, that "to increase the numbers of a people without raising their destiny, is but to prepare a more sumptuous entertainment for death;" and, what is of far greater importance, the labouring classes themselves are awakening from their sleep of ages and coming to a consciousness of their rights and duties, rights which their fellow-men are becoming every day more willing to concede, and duties which they cannot neglect without gross injustice to themselves and their fellow-men. They begin to feel that they are entrusted with talents which ought not to be suffered to lie rotting in the vile napkin of their animal natures; and that it will be a very poor account of themselves at the last day to state that their whole lives were spent in making the nineteenth part of a pin.

Once, it was not disreputable for labourers to be unable either to read or write, and a project for instructing them in these simple branches would have been rejected as visionary, if not dangerous. But happily, now, the meanest labourer is ashamed to be thus ignorant. This feeling is universal. Common schools therefore are provided to supply what is now reckoned among the essential wants of the community though at one time hardly remembered among the superfluities. The rich support these schools. To the poor they are without expense. They lose not even the time which is spent at school. The rich, as we have already explained, pay for that too. This is plain from the conditions of the labourers themselves. They are in all respects better off where schools exist, than where there are none.

The appropriation of time to the purposes of education, which has been gradually gaining ground, more especially since the wonderful improvements in machinery, is but the beginning of a reformation for which those improvements have prepared the way. It is startling to hear one speak in the abstract of labourers giving up a quarter of their time for mental improvement. But the work is begun. Why shall it not go on? Children are taken from the workshop to the school-room. Society suffers not. The time allowed for the education of these classes is prolonged, and the pride which parents take in seeing their children well-instructed is more and more evident. This is what we mean when we speak of fashion converting a good education, even among the humblest of our brethren, into one of the necessaries of life. The Christian Sabbath was the first step in the great cause. Schools for the young came next. And why is the period

of education confined to childhood? Why may not the same fashion, which has thus raised the children, draw the parents to kindred pursuits. Nay, when these children shall become parents, will they forget the lessons of childhood, and depart from the good way in which they have been brought up? But we must leave the subject. Our opinions are;

1. That small manufacturing establishments have a favourable influence upon the community as it respects pauperism.

2. That though large manufacturing towns may not increase legal pauperism, they are unfavourable to the cultivation of man's moral and intellectual nature, and therefore lead to the worst evils of poverty.

3. That no children should be admitted into factories before thirteen years of age, and that until twenty years of age, a portion of each day should be spent in school.

J. H. M.

---

## *Spirituality of Religion.—Goodwin's Sermons.**

There is a conservative principle in a good man's name, that prevents it, whatever the sphere of his activity, from being soon forgotten. Virtue embalms it and preserves its freshness forever. The Author of these Sermons was a quiet, unobtrusive man, spending most of his time and concentrating most of his energies in the circle of his ministerial and parochial duties; but the fragrance of his worth was wafted beyond that circle, and will long continue to refresh the pious, and to make the good regret his early departure.

We have not introduced these Sermons to review them. We have read them with pleasure, and with regret that they are the last we shall have from one who seldom wrote or spoke but to make men better. They seem to us to be *Christian* Sermons, to breathe peculiarly a Christian Spirit, to view things in peculiarly a Christian light, and to estimate them in peculiarly a Christian manner. Their effect is purely religious. While we read them, they seem to spread a calmness

---

* Sermons by the late Ezra Shaw Goodwin, Pastor of the First Church and Society in Sandwich (Mass.) with a Memoir. Boston: Benjamin H. Greene, 1834. 12mo. pp. 268.

over the soul, to hush the turbulence of passion, and to introduce us into the sanctuary of our hearts, to meet our Father God, to derive virtuous energy, pious feeling and holy resolution from sweet but mysterious communings with his holy Spirit.

Mr. Goodwin was remarkable for his spiritual views of religion. He was a Spiritualist—we do not mean in a metaphysical, but in a religious sense. It is this that makes us love to dwell on his memory, and that increases our debt of gratitude to him for his services to Christianity. We are heartily sick of the frigid philosophy of our times, and especially of our own country. There is a coldness in our religious and philosophical speculations, that chills the heart, and freezes up the very life blood of the soul. Disguise it as we will, the philosophy of the times, especially that whose results govern the mass of the people, is materialism. Not, perhaps, materialism, full grown, distinctly perceived, and openly avowed, but secret, almost wholly unsuspected, yet not the less fatal.

The last century and the first fourth of the present, have been distinguished by the progress made in the physical sciences, and in the application of them to the purposes of life. Men's thoughts have been turned almost exclusively to external nature. They have pushed their investigations into the world of matter to a degree all but miraculous; but they have been so engrossed with that world, so delighted with the discoveries they have made in it, that they have almost entirely neglected or denied the existence of that mind, without which it were to us as though it were not. They have been so occupied, so filled with the material world, that they have materialized every thing. The heart has been thrown aside as useless or inconvenient; moral nature has been laid up as having no employment. And judging from some of our school books, we might be led to infer that it is believed, that "children may be trained up in the way they should go" by oxygen, azote, carbon, feldspar, or greywacke, that religion may be sent into them by the Galvanic or Voltaic battery, and that they will be good or bad as they are positively or negatively electrified.

We do not object to the physical sciences; we acknowledge their utility. We see it in the increased power of production given to industry, and the increased facility of transportation and exchange given to commerce. We are grateful for this; for we would be grateful for every good, however great or

however little. But this is only a material good. It only makes us able and comfortable animals. It provides for only the lower wants. This indeed is well. It is desirable to be able and comfortable animals, but it is still more desirable to be human beings. We have no disposition to reject the physical sciences, we do not regret the attention which has been paid to them. Exclusive as that attention has been, it has been beneficial. But we think the time has now come to throw them into their proper rank, to place them at the lowest round of the objects of human study, not at the highest. The moral, religious, and intellectual sciences are as much superior to them as man is superior to a lump of clay.

There are those who conclude when they have ascertained the cause of an evil, that it is not an evil; such persons may infer that materialism should not be considered an evil because it is easy to account for its prevalence. But we do not think that prevents it from being an evil of no small magnitude. We are aware, that but few persons would be willing to acknowledge themselves materialists, we do not even know one individual in our country of any very extensive influence, that would risk his reputation in the defence of a well defined materialism. This, indeed, proves that we are not intentionally, understandingly, materialists; but still we very seldom meet any thing like true religious spiritualism. Indeed, our spiritualism is only a less gross materialism. It goes no farther than the understanding, and is spiritualist only so far, as some ontological questions are concerned. Our metaphysics are as cold and as meagre, as the grossest materialist could desire. Indeed, we have no metaphysics, properly so called, we laugh at every one who has a fondness for them; indeed, we laugh at every attempt to explain or to give some rational account of the mental phenomena. And why is this, but simply because we have no faith in mind? because we do not believe that any thing certain can be known about it? Certainly to have no faith in mind is not to be far from materialism. And we not only have no faith in mind, but we have faith in matter. Who doubts the calculations of the almanac maker, the experiments of the chemist, the principles of mechanics, or the laws of optics? What passes among us for metaphysics, is what might be expected when men's religion makes them nominally forswear materialism, but where there is no faith in mind, but full faith in matter. It is a metaphysics that allows nothing to be true or worthy of the least regard,

that cannot pass under the observation of the five senses, or at least, that cannot be thrown into a formal proposition, tangible to the understanding, and susceptible of a logical demonstration. The testimony of the sentiments is discarded. All our mysterious emotions, our interior cravings, vague longings, and undefined and undefinable instincts are allowed to count for nothing; and philosophy, which should be full of life, warm with a glowing enthusiasm and a generous love, is dwindled down into freezing dialectics.

In our prevailing morality, there seems to be no perception of the beautiful, of the true, the right, the just. There is only the perception of the useful. The right is indeed enjoined, but not as an end; it is enjoined only as a means; not because it is obligatory, but because it is the only sure means of conducting us to happiness. The basis of our morality is selfishness; its measure is our own happiness; its law calculation. If it take a step further and attempt to come out of self, it attains only to general utility, which is nothing but selfishness on a broader scale, or rather a juster calculation, selfishness better understood.

In religion all is outward, objective; nothing inward, subjective. God is placed at an infinite distance from the human soul, deprived of spirituality, or at least clothed with a materiality that prevents him from reaching men's hearts, but by the aid of the understanding, or through the medium of the cumbrous machinery of a formal revelation made to one man to be by him communicated to others. Faith is in something foreign to the soul; in something arbitrary, in that which has no necessary relation to consciousness. Revelation instead of being the inspiration of God, is supposed to be the written word, and is so treated, that one can hardly help inferring that it is believed that heaven or hell depends upon "a various reading," or the rendering of a Greek particle. Protestantism, instead of being viewed as a protest against the authority of the Pope and the traditions of the Church, would seem to be considered a protest against all light which does not come to us through the written word. It seems to be the prevailing conviction of the Christian world, that all wisdom was confined to the Jewish nation, and is to be found only in the Jewish writings. And not content with thus disinheriting all nations except the Jewish, and with cutting off all communication between God and the rest of mankind, we take even those writings in their gross literal sense, instead of studying for

their true spiritual meaning. We busy ourselves with the symbol, without looking to the thing signified, with the forms, rather than with the essence, of the doctrines taught us.

We know not whether there are many to sympathize with us, but we do grieve over this want of spirituality, over this materializing of the Gospel, and this converting the inspirations of the Almighty into cold doctrines and formal precepts that can be written on paper. For ourselves, we should as soon think of seizing the winged lightning and of writing it out with pen and ink as of recording the inspirations of God in a book. Men have spoken, men may speak, as they were, and are, moved by them, but what they speak is something very different from the inspirations themselves. It is not the word of God, for that word is "quick, and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Can men speak that word? Can it be written in a book?

The Christian world seems to us to deny the inspirations of God into the human soul, and to disbelive in the word of God. We do not mean to say that they deny that God once inspired men, that he once spoke to them; but they deny that he inspires them, speaks to them, now. They indeed allow that once God tabernacled with men, was with them their Guide, Instructor, Keeper, Friend; but now he is ascended into the heavens and the earth is forsaken of his presence. Once men heard his voice and it was to them authority; but now for that living voice we have only what men—wise and good men, yet not the less men—what men say, or rather what they wrote, ages ago, that it uttered. We are not satisfied with this. We would not feel ourselves abandoned by our God.—We would not feel that He has turned us over to those who may be deceived themselves, and who, if not deceived themselves, may deceive others. We cannot be content with the cold voice of an ancient book, or with the erring voice of mortal men, where our fathers had the living and true voice of God. We would hear God speak. We would feel his spirit pass over our hearts bringing order out of confusion, and light out of darkness.

And we may hear God now. He speaks to all ages, to all nations, to all individuals, and to "every man in his own tongue wherein he was born." Whoever will enter into the sanctuary of his own heart, into the innermost recess of his soul, shall meet God there, shall hear God speaking to him

in a "still small voice" that shall thrill through the whole man. God has not left us. "There is a spirit in man and the inspiration of the Almighty *giveth* him understanding." We may not hear, but it is because we are not still—because we do not listen. We may not meet God now as the sages and patriarchs, the prophets and apostles of old met him; but it is because we go away from ourselves, because we look abroad for him. We do not go where he is. We must enter into ourselves, go into our own hearts. There, if we will but wait in silence, in the quietude of the soul, with the world shut out, we shall meet him, as sensibly, and hold as sweet, as instructing, and as invigorating communings with him, as did the "holy men of old, who spake as they were moved" by his spirit.

We trust that we shall not be misinterpreted. We do not underrate the written word. We yield to no one in our reverence for it as the record of the views which wise and good men of the Jewish nation took of the revelations made to their souls by the inspirations of the Almighty. But that written word is not a revelation to us. It is only a record of the views taken of a revelation made to others. It is valuable; it is of immense importance; but it is not alone sufficient. We want the spirit of God to breathe into our hearts now, to "reprove us of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment," to "beget us unto a lively hope," to invigorate us for our spiritual progress, and to "bear witness with our spirits that we are born of God." We *assent* to the truth of the written word, that is an act of the understanding, one in which the heart has nothing to do; but we *confide* only in the inspirations of the Almighty, made to our own souls, only in that "true light which enlighteneth every one that cometh into the world.

For ourselves we believe strongly in the internal operations of God's spirit upon our spirit, that there is an intercourse between God and the human soul; and we are unable to separate in our own minds the idea of religion from the idea of this intercourse. Religion is no deduction of reason; it is no calculation of interest; it is a sentiment, an inspiration. It is the poetry of the soul. It enables the soul to call up and solve by a sort of intuition, all the great problems relating to God and to human destiny, and to solve them, not by reasoning, not by reflection, but by faith, sincere, and so firm that it is to the soul like knowledge, only a knowledge of which it can give no account. It opens the eyes of the soul, and gives it power to see truths of the utmost importance to the

conduct of life, but to see them as sentiments, as influences to be felt, rather than as distinct doctrines, which may be brought out and subjected to the action of the understanding.

We believe this, the power of religion, is the direct influence of God upon the human soul. We see no objection to this belief. It is but an influence of spirit upon spirit. The human soul is an image of God, bears a real likeness to him, and has in itself traces of all his attributes. God is wise, and so may be man, and the difference between wisdom in God and wisdom in man is a difference in degree, not a difference in kind. God is good, merciful, just and holy, and so may be man. Now this spiritual likeness which we bear to God, paves the way for an intercourse between him and us. One man imparts wisdom to another, in like manner God may impart wisdom to us. We can infuse our own spirit into the minds of others, and God may infuse his spirit into us, and that spirit may become the power which shall quicken within us, wisdom, justice, mercy, goodness, truth.

Indeed, for God to impart to us his spirit, he has only to awaken and cause to be exerted in us, those spiritual attributes which liken us to him. There is no difficulty in understanding what is the influence he may exert over us. An assembly has met. Heavy responsibilities rest upon its deliberations, and its decisions are big with the fate of millions. Each member is free to offer his own opinion and to follow his own determination. A giant mind discloses itself. One rises who has a clearer conception of the danger to be dreaded, a greater stretch of vision, a mightier grasp of thought; who is more prudent in counsel, firm in resolve, bold and persevering in action. He speaks; his words flash conviction; he infuses his own mind into the minds of those that hear him. All now decide with his wisdom, lean on his advice and follow his direction. Here is an influence of mind over mind, of spirit over spirit; and it is an image of the influence God may exert over the minds of men, and of what we term the inspirations of the Almighty. He thus gives us some glimpses of his own all-powerful, all-comprehending and eternal mind; by the breathings of his spirit, he exalts ours to the exigences of the condition in which we are placed, infuses into us the needed faith and energy, and gives the impulse which carries us forward to the work to be done.

We believe there are few who have not been sensible of the inward breathings of God's spirit upon their souls. Who of us has not often, when conversing with the works of our

Creator, when admiring their beauty and grandeur, their loveliness and utility, been conscious of purer feelings and holier thoughts; of an inward power and a freedom of soul to which we are ordinarily strangers? When alone, in the silence of nature, in the stillness of night, when wrapt in contemplation, when the soul looks in upon herself, and we commune with our own feelings, have we not seemed to hear a sweet and thrilling voice discoursing to us on the loveliness of virtue, and to be conscious of some spirit unveiling all the attractive charms of goodness, and inviting us by motives as sweet and as powerful as heaven to become holy? And have we not at those times resolved that we would? And has there not been then a swelling of the soul, and has not the heart seemed to enlarge, thought to become sublimer, and all our good affections sweeter and stronger? Now that voice we seemed to hear was the voice of God, that spirit was the spirit of God, and that inward movement, that new energy given to the whole spiritual man, were the breathings of God's spirit into the soul.

But let us not be misunderstood: This voice is soft, to hear it we must be still, to understand it we must listen. This spiritual influence rushes upon us not like the mountain torrent. The great and strong wind rent the mountain; God was not in the wind. There came the earthquake, the Lord was not in the earthquake. There came the thunder, the fire which wrapped the mountain in flames; the Lord was not in the thunder, nor in the fire. There came a still small voice, and God was in it. Silent, with noiseless step, and scarcely perceptible is the approach of the Lord; but the prophet who awaits his coming recognises it, wraps himself in his mantle and goes forth to meet him. Weak man is prone to err. He asks for some noisy display of the Almighty. But God's ways are not ours. He walks in majesty, but he walks in stillness; he wheels the spheres in their orbits, but he wheels them in silence, by agents imperceptible, but not on that account the less powerful.

And let us not be prejudiced against this internal operation of God's spirit, this immediate inspiration of the Almighty into the human soul, because some pretenders to it, have been guilty of wild extravagances. We have detected those extravagances, and by what power? By our reason? If reason be adequate to prove that those practices we pronounce extravagant, are extravagant, will not its exercise be able to prevent them? Those pretenders to this inspiration, whom we con-

demn, were exclusive mystics, they supposed that the inspiration of God should supersede reason. This was their error. We must avoid it. The inspirations of the Almighty are given, not to supersede reason, but to aid it, to purge its vision, to increase its power, and to give to the soul an impulse, an energy, an enthusiasm, which reason cannot give; and an intuition, or an inward sentiment of moral truth, of which reason can take no cognizance. God inspires us, but he inspires us as rational, not as irrational beings, to aid us in the work of perfecting our whole nature, not to make us foreswear the exercise of a part. O. A. Brownson.

---

## *Means of Providing the Cure and Preventing the Spread of Infidelity.*

We wish now to inquire what means for checking the spread of unbelief are suggested by a consideration of the nature of Christianity. We are not about to describe all the various modes in which Christianity operates against Infidelity, nor how its operation may be made most effectual in those modes. This would indeed be an endless task. We shall select two points which seem to us of peculiar importance.—Christianity is a rational and a pure system of truth. And that it should be preached in accordance with its nature, rationally and free from corruption, seems essential to its continued existence in the world. It may be presented in so irrational a manner, and in so corrupt a form, as hardly to be presented at all; and if its *life* be its truths, so far as it is perverted in doctrine and in spirit, so far its existence among men is destroyed.

1. Christianity should be preached rationally. We mean by the rational preaching of Christianity, that preaching which rightly adapts Christianity to the reason—the mind of those to whom it is addressed,—without having special reference now to the corrupt or incorrupt character of the subject-matter itself. It may be deemed needless to say anything to Unitarians about the rational preaching of the Gospel. We have been so long accustomed to consider our ministrations of the word so much superior in the respect in question to those of any other denomination of Christians, that it might seem that the

few words to be said on the subject should be rather those of self-congratulation and hope, than those of blame for the past, and apprehension for the future. But we *do* fear that, on this point, Unitarians have been boastful beyond the truth. Yet in one view we can rejoice in the thought that Unitarianism has not been preached so rationally as it might have been. We mean to say, that we think this deficiency explains the fact that the success of Unitarian preaching has not yet given a fitting evidence of that glorious fullness of truth and freedom from error, which as our firm convictions incline us to affirm, strongly mark the system,—and that, by the blessing of God, there is yet an opportunity for such evidence to be furnished.

It is thought Unitarian preaching has been peculiarly rational. But we must express our belief that much of that preaching which has been called rational, till the very name used in its description excites disgust, has been most irrational. Unitarians have preached much as if the world were filled with contemplative philosophers.—We have preached much as if the human mind were pure, cold, unfeeling intellect,—we have preached to the calculating spirit of worldly wisdom,—and in all this, we have been most irrational. Rational preaching takes its character surely from following the directions of truth and reason. Now preaching to the intellect as if it were the whole mind, is not following these directions; and we have been wofully deceived if, in endeavouring to preach rationally, we have supposed *intellectual* preaching and *rational* preaching to be identical things. Rational preaching is that preaching which while it accurately discriminates between the capacities of affection as well as of intellect which man possesses, and clearly sees which of these are most important in a religious point of view, addresses the whole soul, speaks rightly to every faculty, and strives to develope every faculty in its own perfect beauty, and in the exactest harmony of proportion with all around it. That preaching is most rational which takes the greatest pains to discover what is the best mode of building up men's minds in the knowledge of the faith, which clearly and accurately understands and adapts itself to the nature of the human heart, which is just and true to the soul. To make a cool analysis of intellectual principles before the great assembly who have come together with strong faith in the reality of a future world, and with deep anxiety and desire in respect to its issue—and call it rational preaching, is precisely as absurd as to apply the same term to the furious appeal sometimes made to the passions. Beyond

all doubt, calm and incontrovertible truth is the instrument we are to use; but the purpose and end for which we use it is not simply to make it act *upon* the intellect, but *through* the intellect upon the affections, the conscience, and the will. This truth is to be used not that we may have more power over the intellect and less over the heart, not that religious addresses and religious results should be transferred from the moral to the intellectual nature, but precisely contrariwise, that we may gain more power over the heart, and that the intellect should become the servant of the soul. And we do thoroughly believe that Unitarianism rightly presented, will grasp the feelings more strongly, will produce greater intensity of emotion, and act with a mightier power over the whole mind, than any other system of doctrines. There would be an altogether unusual, a tremendous power to such feeling as Unitarianism rightly presented and rightly received would excite. It would be a feeling well directed, suited and proportioned to the importance of occasions, having a steady, abiding, and irresistible action. In this we may dream. We cannot pretend to be founding these remarks on facts of very frequent or very extensive occurrence. But no carefulness of our own has been able to detect the error, if there be an error in supposing that such is the feeling, it would be the tendency of our faith to create, when it is felt in our own souls in all its force, and proclaimed to the world with voices of power, and set in motion, and expanded, and communicated from mind to mind all over the surface of the globe, by earnest and affectionate zeal.

Why is Unitarianism so *powerful* and yet so powerless?—It is powerful truth, but we must open our eyes to the fact, it is truth by far too feebly moved. The *shafts* are heavy, and polished, and perfect; why will not the arms that send them, nerve themselves to more vigour? May we be permitted to say that we believe they are nerving themselves to more vigour, and that the signs of the times here, as well as elsewhere, indicate that Unitarianism is soon to see a more glorious proof of its divinity than it has yet beheld? Oh! let us all remember that, while it is rational to find and hold the truth, yet, having it in our possession, it is most irrational and wicked to let it lie in our minds under the cool and curious perceptions of the intellect, neither embracing it firmly in our own affections, nor applying it to the hearts of others, but eyeing it in the far distance, and simply bringing it into distinct points by the steadiness of our gaze, as the astronomer does the

pale nebula, that just touches upon the border of the visible world, but seems to have little relation to anything in the sphere in which we live except to our own restless curiosity. Our peculiar faith surely presents the strongest occasion, and furnishes the most abundant material for the excitement of feeling. For strong truth is naturally allied with deep feeling, and it is with a firmly convinced intellect that we may in the simplest manner unite a thoroughly awakened heart; but if at the intellect, convinced or unconvinced, we stop, we stop at the mere surface of the religious character.

While on this part of the subject, we wish to add a remark, which brings to view a distinct cause of Infidelity, and one, we fear, of far more powerful action than is generally supposed. We allude to wrong methods of instructing the young in the doctrines and duties of our religion.

If Christianity is often *preached* irrationally to men, it is no less frequently *taught* irrationally to children.

Religious duties are often impressed upon them as things confessedly unpleasant, while they are of binding necessity.—Being taught as if they were averse to instruction, we create in them that very aversion from which they were before free, and which is the greatest enemy to all religious improvement; since it surrounds the whole subject of religion in their minds with images of disgust and abhorrence. Their minds are afterwards made to identify religion with unintelligible distinctions, and vague conceptions of unknown dangers and horrors. A confused sense of duty is produced in the conscience, a habitual astonishment and alarm are created in reference to some mysterious power, which are ever hanging over their heads, gazing into their minds and lives, and ready to strike the blow of punishment called for by any delinquencies in either.

The faith cultivated is not a natural faith, that soars willingly and gladly to the celestial region; but the soul is crushed into a blind, dead, unreasoning belief, and made with weak submission to yield itself up to that spiritual dictation, which is as much worse for the child than for the man, as he is more impotent and unresisting. Such a system of instruction as this, must be strongly influential in preparing the young to be, in maturer years, exposed to the full action and power of every engine of Infidelity. Such a Christian education is the very nurse of unbelief.

If in childhood, religion is laid upon the mind as a weight, it will be shaken off in the first vigour of its youthful strength.

If it is bound upon the mind with cords, the moment sufficient power is gained, those cords will be snapt in sunder.—Every thing goes on the principle of compensation. Extravagance brings weakness, excess want, and transport dependence. On the same principle, in its *reverse* action, the mind will atone for its *subjugation* by its lawlessness.

Let us by a different course of influence make a religious habit of thought, feeling, and action, to be the youthful mind's own decision, and that decision it will never be inclined to annul, —the assaults of Infidelity will but give it an added strength. —Truth is sometimes defined as consisting in the harmonies of creation, and the accordant relations of things. Let us so adapt religion to the young mind, let us cause it so to conform in practice, as we know it does in principle, to its most secret feelings, and so to pierce into its most hidden depths, as to show that Christianity must have come from the same designing wisdom that framed the soul, and contrived all the nicest springs of thought and emotion. Thus shall Infidelity receive at our hands a double counteraction, in the antidote with which we furnish the youthful mind against its power, and in the practical and *intelligible* testimony we thus bear to the world in favour of its divinity.

2. But to prevent unbelief, Christianity must be preached not only rationally, in the sense in which we have used the term, but also free from corruptions.

If there is any part of the subject which calls for the exercise of a practical wisdom and conscientious discretion both in speech and action, it is this.

We must be careful how we use the word *corruptions* in this connection. If we employ it to denote all those articles of faith adopted by all the various sects of Christians not found in our creed, almost the whole of existing Christianity will in our eyes be corrupt and worthy of censure, for the support which by being corrupt it affords to unbelief. Any thing short of perfect purity is indeed corrupt, yet to apply to every thing which thus falls short the term *corrupt* as a *distinguishing* appellation, is to disregard all proportion and all truth.

It is astonishing that Christians should be so much inclined to charge on each other the authorship of Infidelity,—to brand each other with the name of Infidel, and in the language of mutual crimination, and mutual retort, accuse each other of real enmity to Christ and his religion. Opinions and men are to be judged of by their main, direct, and powerful tendencies, and not by their accidental, slight, and transitory ones.

Every great cause, however beneficial in its object, and its general effect, must still, by a necessity attached to all things human, and to divine things also when connected with human passions, produce incidental harm. Thus every form of faith which is extensively received, while in a general way it does its share in preventing the universal dominion of unbelief, and sets in motion many particular influences to the same end, may, by some of its minor tendencies actually bring into existence a degree of positive infidelity. Doubtless one form of Christianity diminishes in this way the genuine result of its variously beneficent action, far more than another. And doubtless some doctrines may be so decidedly inconsistent with truth, and so injurious in their influence, as to authorize the title of *corruptions*. But, by our regard for every principle of justice and expediency, let us not confound corruption of doctrine with simple difference of belief. If we do so, Christianity will need no hands for her overthrow but those of her advocates.

Still further, we believe that these differences of faith are made necessary by the essential constitution of things, and may thus properly be said to result from the ordination of God. Not only so,—we maintain that they have a positive influence in imparting to Christianity life and vigour, and in ultimately recommending it to those who have stood aloof in the ranks of skepticism. Intellectual disagreement, if it do not destroy the "Unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace," preserves to our religion that vitality which, in man's present condition, the universal prevalence of any particular system of faith could not fail we think to destroy.—Moreover, there are few except those whose infidelity is that of a wicked heart, who will not in the midst of opposing sects become interested in some one or other of them, just as the character of one or the other suits best the mental constitution of particular individuals,—and thus different sects, in the conversion of infidels, will become as different means tending to work out the same great result. Infidels do indeed make the disagreement of Christians the ground of objection and maintain that this renders Christianity unworthy of belief. But in almost all cases this is but the ostensible cause of their unbelief, which covers other causes of deeper foundation. Indeed the infidel could hardly avoid receiving back the shock of his objection in the shape of an *argumentum ad hominem*:—for if the differences of the various sects of Christians in an essential point, proves them completely wrong, what shall be said of the faith of infidels, or

their want of faith, in regard to religious subjects, exhibiting as it does not only their entire disagreement with and opposition to all Christians, but a complete absence of unity and consistency in Infidelity itself.

It is *dissension* not *difference* among Christians that produces unbelief. What is intellectually true may be maintained in a temper as false as was displayed by the lying prophets of Baal. This temper is the Satan, while speculative truth is the garment of light in which he is clad. He who maintains that Christianity should go forth one rigid, uniform, unbending system of doctrine, and that it must thus be received by every individual before there can truly be any life of religion in his soul, ought first to have proved the assumed premises in his argument, that all minds have been cast in the same mould, and all hearts accustomed to the same mode of feeling,—propositions which can never of course be anything like an approximation to truth, so long as the numberless modifications of mental constitution which we behold, continue.

Still with all these qualifyingremarks, and they seem to us of great importance, we lament that we must express our strong conviction that wrong opinions maintained by Christians have done and are doing much to promote the spread of infidelity. They are doing much more to this end in one place than in another. Where Christianity has been comparatively unknown, its *first* exposition, however marked by error and corruption, is almost as undoubtingly regarded as being Christianity in all its truth and purity as the apostles' was the exposition made from Heaven in the tones of his voice who "spake as never man spake." And if, on account of the error and corruption, the *Religion* is once rejected, there is little hope that any new appeal in its behalf, however nobly they may describe its glorious evidences and doctrines, will be successful. We must all be persuaded that the panoply in which Christianity has been sent forth to abide the assaults of the infidel has been unwieldy and hurtful: her defence has been placed upon untenable and certainly unnecessary points. Were the infidels' intellect more powerful than it is, we should even now tremble for the effect which, for instance, the prevalent opinions concerning the Old Testament threatens to the future prosperity of our faith. Christianity should, in the first place, be made to rest on its own strong foundations, which are deep-laid enough to support the glorious fabric, though all others should crumble in the dust. We would by no means speak lightly of the important bearing which the Jewish Scriptures have on the Chris-

tian covenant; but we do tremble when we see Christianity allowed by her advocates to depend for permission to live on the successful defence of trivial points relating to the Old Dispensation, points where defence may after all chance to be a very doubtful matter.

Support Christianity by whatever you can, but never forget or forsake her own self-sustaining energy,—never hazard her authority upon the cast of a doubtful die. She should be freed from those encumberances which a blind,—yes,—and a *generous* faith, existing in the soul with such inherent strength as to believe everything of celestial origin to which uncontradicted external circumstances have assigned a supernatural character, has fastened about her. Faith, existing with the energy it does in every human mind, gives in itself irresistible assurance of the reality of its objects. But our Faith should not be a thoughtless one. Faith may soar higher than the eye of reason can reach, but she must not flit before the objects which reason clearly sees, and deny their existence. If we believe without being able to give a reason for the hope that is in us, we shall loosen the corner-stone of religion in the high intellects of the world. We shall completely expose our Faith to the dangerous assaults of the cold-hearted infidel, to subtle philosophy. We may, in contempt of all that is true, even in a blind faith, in contempt of all that assurance which even a *blind* faith casts in a steady stream of brilliance into the future life, sound abroad the frightful changes of superstition, bigotry and fanaticism. If we would continue and confirm the hold which our religion now has on the superior mind of the world, and would save from infidelity those minds which now make almost its only strength, let us know what that religion in itself *is*, let us not teach for doctrines the commandments of men; "seeing that we are compassed about by so great a cloud of witnesses," let us send forth Christianity to their view clothed in the brightness and purity of her heavenly vesture and the fullness of her immortal vigour. We cannot expect to change, in the respects in which it needs change, the general faith of the Christian world, by an influence as sudden as that of a shaft of lightning. We must move that faith into its right position not so much by violent shocks as by strong and steady pressure. We should act not temporizingly, in a bad sense, and not at all timidly, but yet with prudent wisdom,—a wisdom not opposed to the plain prompter of the internal monitor, but dictated by those promptings. The *public* like the *individual* mind must some-

times be prepared for particular influences, before those influences can act with their greatest power.

We have been surprised at the frequency with which, in infidel publications, objections are urged against doctrines which, in the form in which they are objected to, we do not find in the Bible, and which therefore, so far as our Faith is concerned, we have no occasion to invalidate. Those doctrines have been mingled by their supporters with the eternal verities of the Gospel. But in that relationship the infidel does not allow them to remain. He singles them out from the connection in which they stand in the creed and in the mind of the believer, considers them as fully accordant with the real temper of the Gospel, and reasons against them as against the whole system of Christianity. How many minds, already trembling on the verge of Infidelity, are thus induced to make the fatal plunge—to descend from one gloomy abyss to another, till they find they have no power of returning to the lighted surface of the region of truth, but are compelled to remain painfully groping about and enduring their own self-condemnation, in the cold and misty caverns of skepticism. We must defer for a time the consideration of the remaining branch of our subject. C. A. Bartol.

---

## *Jesus a Divine Teacher of Morals.*

### No. II.

Nicodemus, the Jewish ruler, felt so deeply the need, and prized so highly the character, of a moral teacher, that he incurred the risk of ridicule, odium, or even degradation, in order to receive the instructions of such a teacher. Nor does the teacher whom he visited accuse him of attaching too high a value to that office. On the other hand, he tacitly assents to the rank which Nicodemus assigns it, by proceeding at once to give the instruction sought.

In a former article I remarked upon the opinion presumptuously entertained by some, that if Jesus had no higher office than that of a moral teacher he might as well never have been sent, since there have been, and still are, uninspired men fully competent to this work. In controverting this

opinion I attempted to show that a divine moral teacher was needed in order that a perfectly pure system of morals might be promulgated.

II. I observe, in the second place, that no teacher, unless sent from God, would have been adequate to this work.

Motives which operate powerfully upon one class of men, often have no effect upon another. Every man is apt to imagine men in general like himself, or his immediate associates. Or if not, he is too ignorant of the characters of other men, to adapt himself as a teacher to their circumstances and wants. Therefore, an uninspired moral teacher will either attempt unsuccessfully to issue instructions adapted to the wants of mankind at large, or will more modestly content himself with adapting his instructions to the circumstances of those with whom he is immediately conversant. Now the danger is not that man will remain without a moral rule; for man is by his very nature a moral being. The difficulty has always been that men have had too many standards of action, that one nation has been guided by one class of motives, and another by another,—that the rich and powerful have based their rules of conduct on expediency, the learned on philosophy, the vulgar on superstition. Thus the Spartans made positive law, the Athenians patriotism, the Romans in the days of the republic, justice, the Carthaginians, a principle nearly allied to the honour (falsely so called) of the present day, their common standard of action. Thus many of the magistrates and leading men of ancient Greece and Rome, derided alike philosophy and religion. The philosophers despised the popular theology, but at the the same time allowed that the motives to virtue which their philosophy furnished, were adapted only to minds of the highest elevation; while the common people shaped their conduct according to the capricious dictates of a religion administered by hireling priests. Now, though this state of things was better for the individuals concerned, than a state in which no moral law was recognised, it was not much better adapted to advance the social interests of man. Different classes of men, having no moral principles in common, could have no mutual confidence. A religious man could repose no trust in the philosopher who ridiculed all that he deemed sacred, nor could men of elevated minds confide unhesitatingly in an integrity which had an absurd superstition for its only safeguard. To this state of things we may attribute the utter want of sympathy, and the constant jealousy between the different classes of society under every pagan government, and

the insecurity of promises and contracts even when cemented by oath. The want of a common basis of moral obligation, prevented also international confidence. Each party in a national contract always cherished a vague suspicion that the other might be hollow-hearted,—unprincipled—and that very suspicion made each party what it deemed the other to be.—Hence sprang national animosities, retaliations, wars. In this way was man's progress towards refinement constantly retarded, as rank clashed with rank, profession with profession, nation with nation: and one great reason why Christian countries are more perfectly civilized than any others, is, that the gospel, by furnishing all classes and all nations with an uniform standard of duty and class of motives for its discharge, has restored mutual confidence. The gospel has in fact established a moral currency for Christendom, a currency of promises, covenants and oaths, which has imparted new energy to all man's social relations and functions. And a currency of this kind is no less essential to the well-being and improvement of society, than a good pecuniary medium of circulation is to the operations of business. Thus we see that a moral system was needed, which should be adapted to the wants of men of every nation, age, and condition. Before Christ appeared, benevolent efforts for the moral good of mankind had been made by wise and virtuous men; but they had showed themselves inadequate to the work of forming such a system, and no wonder that they were incapable of it. For what an immense range of knowledge must the author of such a system have? Think what a diversity of powers different human minds possess, what a diversity of moral characters the human race comprehends. There is the earth-bound sensualist to be renewed and supported by the same power which is still to purify and ennoble the truly heavenly mind of Fenelon. There is the moral nature of the infant and the unlettered adult to be developed by the same power which holds the transcendant intellect of Newton in allegiance to truth and duty. Does such a work belong to man? As well might he have been the author of that hidden energy which binds alike, atom to atom, and world to world. The work is God's. It belongs to him alone who made man, and who therefore knows all the capacities,—all the energies of his nature. Man needed a divine teacher, and sublime as are the powers and the destiny of the human spirit, was the office of that teacher.

But not only does man need a perfect moral system and

one of universal adaptation. He needs also an authoritative system.

III. I would remark in the third place, that a system, in order to be authoritative, must be promulgated by a divinely accredited agent, and with such sanctions as shall show adherence to it, to be man's highest interest.

It must be promulgated by a divinely accredited agent. Man will never feel himself bound to embrace the counsel of his fellow man. External rank or power will not entitle one to moral supremacy; for mere conventional distinctions confer no intellectual prerogatives. Nor would actual mental and moral superiority enable a man to legislate for the moral conduct of all his brethren. For where is that superiority which ignorance might not doubt, which envy would not slander, which pride would fail to deny? But let such a superiority be universally admitted, where is its possessor's right to issue moral precepts? With that strong feeling of independence which is a part of human nature, men will not readily yield up their conduct (especially when the question is between self-indulgence and self-denial,) to the sway of one who bears not most manifestly a divine commission. Man needs then in his moral teacher the badge of office. He needs the voice of attestation from the Excellent Glory. He demands to see by working with the teacher, in the sight of his brethren, by signs and wonders. It was such testimony that brought Nicodemus to the feet of Jesus. "Thou art a teacher come from God," says he, "for no man can do these miracles that thou dost except God be with him."

Not only must a moral system, in order to be authoritative, be promulgated by an accredited agent; it must also have sanctions sufficient to enlist self-love in its favour. These sanctions must be derived from the tendency or consequences of adherence to it and of departure from it. Now none but the Author of all effects can trace unerringly effects from their causes. None but him in whose hand is the destiny of man can appoint the different degrees of happiness or misery which shall follow different courses of conduct. Every moral system must depend for its sanctions on the doctrine of a retribution; and this is a doctrine which unaided man could not discover; for in this life there is not a perfect retribution, and the realities of the spiritual world, God and he whom God has sent alone can unfold. Man might indeed prop up his own systems by an appeal to the imperfect retributions of this life. But the very fact that they are imperfect and often

easily evaded, would lead men to transgression. Though they would be willing to acknowledge virtue in general the best policy, passion or appetite would be continually claiming particular exceptions.

But it may be said that fear of the future consequences of sin is a motive unworthy the dignity of man's moral nature, that virtue is its own reward—that the love of virtue apart from any authority which commands or sanctions it, ought to be a sufficient and the only motive to its practice. To this I would answer: I acknowledge terror to be an inferior motive. But man cannot always act from the highest motive. He is often obliged first to act from a lower motive in order to appreciate a higher. Thus he must not only see but practise virtue, before he can love it for its own sake,—for the peace and joy which not only follow, but attend it. When a child obeys his parent from fear of the rod, he acts from a very low motive. But if the rod be wielded with a reference to moral distinctions, he will be trained up through fear of it in a good course, the innate excellence of which he will soon perceive, and will persevere in it from fear no longer, but from disinterested love. Yet the rod was essential to bring him to the state in which the rod becomes useless, and thus terror is stationed at the outposts of the kingdom of heaven. His angry voice arrests the guilty wanderer, and the song of sinful pleasures ceases to charm him, and her wreath withers, and her countenance grows loathsome. He commences the practice of virtue not for the joy set before him, but for the dangers which lie behind him. But he soon finds from experience that the ways of wisdom are ways of pleasantness, and even were they not guarded by the flaming sword of retribution, would be unwilling to forsake them. He has now arrived at a stage of his moral progress in which terror is useless, but at a stage in order to bring him to which terror was essential. The time will come, when, in the sublime language of the prophet's vision, "the knowledge of the Lord will fill the earth as the waters cover the sea." Then the thunders of the gospel will need no longer to be echoed upon earth. Then terror will have discharged his ministry, and will yield place to love, the presiding genius of the renovated world. Then the infant will wake into life in the dwelling-place of righteousness, where he will see neither vice nor misery, where he will behold the unalloyed happiness of virtue, the fearless beauty of holiness, where sin will be thought of only as a historical event or as a barely possible act of moral suicide.

But this happy state of things will have been effected through the agency of terror,—through the strictly defined sanctions of the moral law; and, though these sanctions will then be needless, yet, were they now abrogated, the law would become a dead letter, and the reign of virtue upon earth would never be established.

Thus we see that men needed a moral system guarded by sufficient sanctions, and these sanctions none but God could supply. A teacher from God was therefore needed; and, had not Christ spoken by manifest authority from his Father and drawn motives from the spiritual world, his winning eloquence, his purity, his self-devotion would have been but impotent.

Thus have I shown the need in which man stood of a teacher to be sent from God. Now if the instructions of a divine teacher were thus essential to man's present and future well-being, the office was one of the highest dignity; and if Christ bore no other, that alone was worthy of the long series of prophecies, of the angelic embassies, of the heavenly minstrels which ushered him into the world.

God has spoken to us through Christ. He has made plain to us the path of duty. He has shown us distinctly what modes of conduct meet his approbation and what his displeasure, and how shall we show our gratitude to him for this revelation? Surely by aiming to be perfect even as his law is perfect. If we neglect a single duty, if we cherish a single sin, we forfeit our privileges as Christians, for the heathen world may in that case furnish us with as good a moral law as we keep. The precepts of the gospel were designed not to diminish the number of the sins committed or allowed, but to put away sin; and he who commits or allows any sin is unworthy of the gospel light.

God has through Christ given us a moral system which is designed for all men, and is adapted to make each man worthy of the confidence and love of all. And do we perceive the immense advantages which would result to our race from the union of all men under this perfect law? Let us then strive to build up the cause of Christian virtue, as far as our influence extends, by the light of a holy example, by our counsels, admonitions, and prayers, by the gifts of a willing heart and a liberal hand. Thus fellow-labourers with Christ in the great harvest field may share his glorious reward in heaven.

Christ has spoken to us with divine authority. He, who

despises him that is sent, despises Him that sends. By refusing to obey Christ, we insult our heavenly Father, the Author of our being, the Giver of all good, him from whom we have all that we have, and hope all that we hope.

God has through Christ revealed to us the conditions of our spiritual destiny. He holds forth to us those things which are true, honest and lovely, and says, "These keep and do, and thou shalt live." He points to those things which degrade the soul, and says, "Those love and practise, and thou shalt worse than die." Oh let us not rush to ruin, regardless of the awful destiny which awaits the disobedient. "Behold I come quickly," saith the Son of Man, "and my reward is with me to render to every man according to his work." Oh let us have respect unto the recompence of reward. Let us obey the Teacher who comes from God. That teacher is a Saviour too, able and willing to save all who come to God through him. The day is at hand when heaven and earth shall pass away; the principles of his gospel shall endure, and those who have walked by them on earth, shall realize through eternity the fulfilment of its promises. A. P. P.

---

## *A Letter on the Unitarianism of the First Three Centuries of the Christian Era.*

[Concluded, from page 386.]

When we wish to ascertain the opinions held by any particular church, at any given period, we naturally inquire in the first instance, whether such Church had a written creed or formula of faith, and if so, we then refer to such creed as to the best authority, for what such church did believe. Now it is accidentally in my power, to give to the reader the several creeds of the church, in each of the first five centuries, and that will enable him to form his own opinion, on the subject matter of our inquiry.

In the first century, we meet with no other Creed than the simple one contained in the Scriptures, namely, that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah or Christ of God. This creed was the rock, on which our Saviour assured Peter that he would build his church, and that the gates of hell should never prevail over it. Matt. xvi. 16–18. It was this Creed, which the Apostle Peter taught to the assembled Jews, on

the day of Pentecost. Acts ii. 36. The Apostle John wrote his Gospel for the special purpose of inculcating this simple Creed, John xx. 31; and when the Apostle Paul was miraculously converted to a knowledge of the truth, the first, the great burthen of his preaching was, to convince his hearers, that Jesus was indeed the Christ. Acts ix. 22.

The creed of the Church, in the second Century, is found in the works of Irenæus, and reads as follows:

"The Church," says Irenæus, "though scattered through every part of the whole earth, has received from the Apostles and their disciples a belief which is: 1. That there is one God, the omnipotent Father, who made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things which are in them; 2. That there is one Jesus Christ, the Son of God, made incarnate for the sake of man's salvation; 3. That there is a Holy Spirit, who through the Prophets, foretold the economy and coming of our beloved Lord Jesus Christ, his generation [descent] from the Virgin, his suffering and resurrection from the dead, his reception up into heaven in the flesh, and his coming from heaven in the glory of the Father, for the purpose of collecting all things together, and of raising up all flesh of the whole human race; 4. That according to the will of the invisible Father, every knee in heaven and on earth and under the earth shall be bent to Christ Jesus, our Lord and Saviour and King, and every tongue acknowledge him, and that he shall execute just judgment upon all, and send the wicked spirits, and transgressing angels, and whoever were in revolt, and likewise impious and unjust and abandoned and blasphemous men, into eternal fire; but the just and holy, who have kept his commands, and continued in love, either from the beginning, or after repentance, having given them life, he shall endow with immortality, and surround with eternal glory."

In the works of Tertullian, who lived in the third century, we meet with the creed of the church in his days, which reads thus:

"We believe that there is one only God, but under the dispensation which we call the Economy, that of this one God there is also a Son, his Word, who proceeded forth from him, through whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made; that he was sent by the Father into the virgin, and was born of her, man and God, Son of man and Son of God, and called Jesus Christ; that he suffered, died, and was buried according to the Scriptures, and

raised again unto life by the Father, that he was taken up into the heavens, to sit at the right hand of the Father, and that he is about to come, to judge the living and the dead; and that according to his promise, he hath sent the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, from the Father, the Sanctifier of the Faith of those who believe in the Father, Son and Holy Spirit."

To the labours of my antagonist, I am indebted for the Nicene Creed in its original form, as passed at the council of Nice in the year 325. As given by him, it reads thus:

"We believe in one God, Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible: and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, the only begotten, that is of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God: begotten not made, consubstantial with the Father; by whom all things both in heaven and earth were made, who for us men, and our salvation, came down from Heaven, and was incarnate, and made man, and suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended into Heaven, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost. And the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes those who say, that there was a time when the Son of God was not; or that he was not before he was born; or that he was made out of nothing, or of another substance or essence, or that he was created, or mutable."

The fifth and last creed, is that generally known by the name of the Athanasian. Not that this creed was composed by St. Athanasius, but because the unknown author, who composed it, in the fifth century, thought proper to give it as the work of that saint, for the purpose of giving it currency.*

Here then we have the Creeds of the Church during the first five centuries. The first thing which will strike every one, who peruses them with attention, will be the great, the marked difference, which there is in their contents, showing that the belief of the Church was essentially different, at these different periods. He will also feel the *gradual transition* which there is from one sentiment to another; and as the first creed is avowedly the one held by Unitarians, and the last, the one held by Trinitarians, the inference is irresistible, that the Church, which was Unitarian in the beginning,

---

* Our author here cites this creed at length. The reader who may wish to consult it will please turn to pp. 289–90 of this Journal.—Ed.

gradually became Trinitarian. To render this still more clear, I would beg the reader's attention to a few observations on the several contents of these Creeds. Of the doctrine of the Trinity, we are constantly told, that it is one of the *fundamental* doctrines of Christianity; one that forms the foundation on which the whole Christian system rests; and a belief in which is absolutely necessary to entitle any one to the name of Christian, and hence too, this dogma forms one of the most prominent features in the Creeds of every one of the Trinitarian Churches. Now of this doctrine, thus declared to be of such vital importance, we do not find even a trace in the Creeds of the first three Centuries. The terms, Trinity, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost, three persons in one God, Consubstantiality, and other terms, indispensably necessary to express this dogma, are no where met with there, nor do we meet there, with any expressions, which bear the slightest resemblance to those above enumerated, or which can by any ingenuity be tortured, so as to convey the same meaning. The conclusion is therefore irresistible, that these Creeds are purely Unitarian, and that hence the Church, which had these Creeds, and none other, as the Universal rule of faith, must have been Unitarian too. It is true, that in the Creed of the third century, the term *God* is applied to our Saviour, a thing which we do not find in the Creeds of the two first Centuries; but that this term must be here taken in its subordinate acceptation, is perfectly evident from the context. The reader cannot help observing, the great similarity there is between the Creed, now generally known by the name of the Apostles' Creed, and the creed found in Irenæus. This is natural, as the former Creed, was composed not by the Apostles, but by some Christian Doctor, from the Creed of the second Century, though some of the articles in it, are of a subsequent date. Before I leave this part of my subject, I would call the reader's attention, to what Irenæus says, of the universality of the Creed as given by him. It was not the Creed of a particular sect, but of the whole Church, through the whole earth; and now, if this Creed is Unitarian, (and that it is so appears to me to be perfectly incontestable from its context,) it follows, that the whole church must have been Unitarian too, during the second Century.

"A Presbyterian" considers the Nicene Creed, as a true Trinitarian Creed, and I admit that it has been most generally viewed in this light. This, however, I believe to be a mistake. In that Creed the word Trinity is nowhere found; neither is

the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, as a person distinct from the Father, any where asserted in it. It constantly speaks of the Father and the Son as *two* Beings, as perfectly distinct the one from the other, as two men can be. It considers the Father as the self-existing God, and the author of every thing else that exists; and the Son, as a Being who is God of God, that is, God by communication, and who derived his existence from the Father. Nowhere do we find there the *equality* of the Son with the Father asserted. On the contrary, every thing leads us to the belief, that the Nicene Fathers considered Christ as a Being subordinate to the Father, and dependent on Him. All that they did decree, which in any way approaches Trinitarianism, is, that the Son is of the same substance with the Father.—That these are not the Trinitarian doctrines of the present day, must be apparent to all, though I admit that what was settled at Nice, ultimately led to the adoption of this incomprehensible dogma.

The Athanasian is the true Trinitarian Creed, and the first in which the doctrine of the Trinity, as now held, is expressly taught. It is the first in which we meet with the term *Trinity;* it is the first, which teaches the *equality* of the Son and Holy Spirit, with the Father; it is there, that we first find it asserted, that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, are each of them God, are each of them eternal, are each of them uncreated, and yet, that these three Persons or Beings, (for these words evidently have here the same meaning,) are only one Being. Now all this is pure Trinitarianism, and hence too, the Athanasian Creed was adopted, as containing the true faith, in all the Trinitarian Churches, and is retained in most of them, up to this day; and if in some of the Protestant Churches, this Creed is now no longer used, yet other creeds of the same tenor, and of nearly the same phraseology, have been substituted for it. Whoever reads the Athanasian Creed, cannot help observing the very prominent place, which the doctrine of the Trinity occupies in it, and this to me is proof, that this doctrine at that time was a new one, and that hence so much pains was taken to inculcate it.

As "A Presbyterian" has expressed his regret, that in my former letter I did not enter more fully into the *progressive* state of the Trinitarian doctrine, during the fourth and fifth centuries, and as a short historical sketch of the rise and progress of Trinitarianism, may not be unacceptable to the

reader, I shall here endeavour to give a very condensed view of it.

I have stated it before, to have been the belief of most of the ante-Nicene Fathers, that God, previous to the creation of the Universe, call a super-angelic Being into existence, and made him his *Instrument* in the work of creation. This super-angelic Being, denominated the Logos or Word, they held to have become afterwards incarnate, as the Christ or Messiah. In the beginning of the fourth century, a dispute arose, whether this Logos had been created out of nothing, or was a direct emanation from the Deity, and formed from his own essence. This last idea has nothing to sta tle us, when we reflect, that many of the philosophers of that day held, that all souls were direct emanations from the Deity, and portions of the Divine Essence. The opinion, that the Logos had been formed from the Divine Essence, was a favourite one among the Christian Fathers of the Platonic School, and among them, of Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt. This opinion was controverted by Arius, his Presbyter, who maintained, that the Logos was created out of nothing. Such was the origin of the famous Arian controversy. As this controversy caused some disturbance in the Church, Constantine, the first Christian Emperor convened in the year 325, a Council at Nice in Bythinia, at which the doctrine of the substantiality prevailed. Now although that which was settled at Nice, fell far short of being the doctrine of the Trinity, yet it very naturally led to it. Men gradually carried out the doctrine of substantiality to its natural result, and though this progress might be somewhat retarded, by the Unitarianism of the common people, and the decrees of the synod of Jerusalem about the year 330, and of the council of Rimini, in the year 359, at which latter more than four hundred Bishops met, whose decisions were favourable to the cause of Arianism, yet the contrary doctrine gradually became predominant, and at the Council of Constantinople held in the year 381, the equality of the Son and the Holy Spirit with the Father was solemnly decreed. Not to break the thread of my narrative, I have hitherto made no mention of the Holy Spirit, except in the last paragraph. This omission I shall now supply. By the earliest Christians, the Holy Spirit was considered, not as a person distinct from the Father, but as a divine influence or power. At a pretty early date however, the Holy Spirit began to be considered by some as a Being, having a distinct personal existence, and one, who,

together with Christ, was an agent in communicating the bounties of the Almighty Father to mankind. In point of rank, the Holy Spirit was generally considered to be inferior not only to the Father but to Christ also.—This lasted until after the Nicene Council. At that council we find nothing said of the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit, with the Father and the Son; but about the middle of the fourth century, that doctrine began to be taught, by some of the Fathers of the Church, and that with such success, that at the council of Constantinople A, D. 381, the perfect equality of the Holy Spirit, with the Father and the Son, was decreed, as before stated.

But though this equality of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, was thus decreed, yet there remained still considerable objections to it arising from the many clear passages in Scripture, in which the inferiority of the Son to the Father, is most explicitly taught. To remove this difficulty, the doctrine of two natures in Christ was invented, and confirmed by the decrees of the council of Ephesus held A. D. 431, and afterwards *amended* and *improved*, at the council of Calcedon, held A. D. 451, whereby the doctrine of the Trinity was nearly reduced to its present form. But though this incomprehensible dogma was thus decreed by the Councils, yet it took much time and trouble to bring the multitude, who remained practical Unitarians, over to the new faith; and in Priestley's early opinions, vol. 2, we find what offence the introduction of the Trinitarian Doxology, "Glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit," gave to the multitude, as a novelty, and the introduction of new objects of worship.* There were however two causes which cooperated powerfully, in causing the Doctrine of the Trinity to be ultimately received. The first was, the growing superstition of the age, which inclined men to deify subordinate objects, as is evident from the fact, that, in the beginning of the fifth century, if not earlier, men began every where to pay di-

* Those who are desirous of knowing, what were the Doxologies of the primitive Church, will find them Matt. 6. 13. "For thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the Glory, forever. Amen." Rom. xvi. 27. "To God only wise be glory, through Jesus Christ, forever. Amen." 1. Tim. i. 17. "Now unto the King Immortal, Invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory, forever and ever. Amen." And Jude i. 25, according to Griesbach's Text: "To the only God our Saviour, through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, as before all time, so now and throughout all ages. Amen."—These are the true doxologies which were from the beginning; but then, all of them are purely Unitarian.

vine worship to the Virgin Mary, and to departed saints and martyrs, a practice continued in the Roman Catholic and Greek churches to this day. The second cause was, that after the advent of Theodosius in 379, most of the Roman emperors were warmly attached to the cause of *orthodoxy*, and that these, and especially Theodosius and Justinian, forced the people, by the most merciless persecutions, to adopt the theological subtleties, which the doctors had decreed.

I have thus endeavoured to establish that the Church was Unitarian during the first three centuries after Christ, and I have also endeavoured to trace the rise and progress of the doctrine of the Trinity; and though I feel fully sensible of the imperfect manner in which my task has been accomplished, yet I flatter myself, that enough has been done, to convince every unprejudiced reader, that it was the universal belief of those early ages, that God is ONE, a Being of simple UNITY.

OBERLIN.

*Meadville, Dec.* 6, 1830.

---

## *The Unitarian Abroad.*

THE circumstances which test the power of personal religion are as various as the incidents of individual experience; yet some ofthese are singularly prominent and influential; and hence their effect upon religious faith and practice is deserving of the most serious regard. No expedient is more commonly made use of by the advocate of any particular system than to refer to its efficacy in affliction and its powerful support in the hour of death. But there are other and more important trials to which humanity is subject which throw her more completely upon her own resources, and affect more nearly that principle with which religion is most intimately allied,—we mean character. These, then, are the tests to which reference should chiefly be had by him who would prove the strength of his own Christian faith and principle, and by those who would judge of the actual tendency of any system of belief.

Among these important events, is that which severs a man from the influences and society of his home, and sends him forth to be a stranger and a sojourner in distant lands. Let

not the frequency of such an incident or the casual circumstances which attend it deprive it of its actual importance as a part of moral and religious not less than of intellectual experience. The mere fact of a being so much the creature of habit and association as is man,—shaking off the familiar influences which country, kindred, and local society have generated around him,—and entering, at once, into another and a widely different sphere—this we say is sufficient to render the event of which we speak—one which will more or less agitate the elements and try the practical strength of faith. A wider scope is thus afforded to his observing faculties, an opportunity of comparing long-cherished opinions and practices not with familiar differences, but with such as are far without the influence as they are separated by intrinsic peculiarities, from any which he has personally known. In short being placed amid new and dissimilar social as well as physical scenes,—by the force of contrast alone,—a process of self-revelation is commenced within him, and little introspection is requisite to make him conscious of a new and hitherto unappreciated power in his personal religion, or to awaken him to a poignant sense of its unsettled character and its slight hold upon his deepest thoughts and strongest affections. It is alike interesting and valuable, therefore, to one entertaining those views of the Supreme Being, of the Gospel of his Son and of human duty and destiny which distinguish us, to observe, as narrowly as may be, the influence of these sentiments when occupying more extensive fields of observation and subjected to impressions from foreign objects. The inquiry, considered at large, is indeed too broad and general to form the subject of the few remarks which can here be afforded; still in particular points, it may suggest reflections not altogether unimproving.

In speaking of the Unitarian abroad, we will not follow him through the populous cities and fertile country of England,—where are chosen temples, dedicated to the faith he loves, a ministry vigorous in its support, and a general sentiment of liberality of which that faith is the very spirit. Nor will we attempt to describe the feelings of unutterable sadness with which he must behold so many of the French nation driven by an irrational and a false theology into the most hardy skepticism; or dwell upon the eminent satisfaction which glows in his breast at the evident preparation for receiving and developing a better hope at present existing among them. But we will speak of him as the temporary denizen of that

land, most of whose ground is hallowed by the records of history, and whose chief attractions are, of all material objects, second only to nature, in their power of affecting the human soul.

The prevalence of Catholicism, in an age like this, wherever its effects are seen, and most of all, in a country possessing the moral associations of Italy, must inspire in every reasonable mind similar emotions of wonder and regret. Yet when subsequent attention has evinced the complete sway exercised over the people by the priesthood,—a sway often acquired and perpetuated through the weaker minded of the women, and the jealous care with which every avenue of information is guarded and every germ of liberal feeling crushed,—it seems wonderful that results more baneful are not exhibited, and that there should be even the present scanty evidences of mental refinement and moral intelligence. One conclusion,—distinct and strong, the Unitarian can scarcely avoid feeling, and that is, that the moral revolution which must precede every successful effort for political enfranchisement, must be vivified by a quickening and most elevated religious sentiment, one which shall soar far above every superstitious error and exclusive opinion. In a word, the mournful effects of the exact contrary of his own system—so prominently exhibited in Italy, awaken in the mind of the Unitarian a thrilling sense of the power and preciousness of his faith. And when he realizes that great lesson which an extended knowledge of this world and its inhabitants ever teaches—the lesson of universal charity, it does not dawn upon him as a long-neglected truth,—but as the confirmation of what the genius of his belief had ever imparted. A view of the widely different native propensities and talents, and the not less distinct processes of education and course of circumstances which have combined to make men what they are in distant parts of the globe—must induce, in every reasonable mind, that broad, liberal judgment of humanity which the Unitarian advocates; and to him it is no small gratification to find that his system, from its rational foundation,—anticipates the experimental annunciation of so important a truth.

In a country of ancient greatness and unrivalled art, the mental developments and future destiny of man are presented in a most affecting light to human contemplation. And in such thoughts, awakened by the most soul-breathing productions of the chisel and the pencil, or aroused by the imposing presence of antiquity—does not the religious principle illu-

mine and carry out the mind's spontaneous impressions? When such fruits of genius are most livingly existent, and most holily exciting,—can he who stands before them—for a moment doubt the moral capacity of their authors? And, amid the magnificent ruins of a bygone age and people, what consolation is there for the oppressive sense of the awful power of time over the material results of man's thought and labour,—but that involved in a sublime confidence in the blessed futurity of his being?

But, perhaps, in nought is the Unitarian more impressively confirmed by his experience abroad, than in that necessity of individual and direct moral effort which he recognises as essential to his spiritual growth,—and the great end of Christianity. In proportion as contact with novel or opposing circumstances reveals man to himself so he must feel that his highest distinction lies in his power of self-government,—that the virtue which conscience demands is an exercise of energy, a maintenance of character, a steady loftiness of purpose; and that it is this, and this only in which consists the pervading spirit of the Gospel, and above all that unfolded in the example of its Author. Environed by habitual and therefore powerful restraints, one may speculate coolly upon the uselessness or secondary value of human effort in the work of religious self-improvement,—but a different and less secure position in the world will induce and urge into practice a contrary sentiment or it will endanger to the utmost a character so unguarded.

It is when thus situated, indeed, that the Unitarian, peculiarly, rejoices in that latent enthusiasm which is inherent in his belief, when that belief has entered into and penetrated his spirit. Having ever known the necessity and felt the glory of personal religious endeavour, its exercise is the great intent of his spirit. Blest with tenets too simple and pure to linger in the cold vestibule of his mind, they actuate and inspire without that foreign excitement essential to the maintenance of more complex systems. Away from the genial warmth of sympathy, his faith lives brightly in his bosom with all the beautiful fertility of truth.

It is, too, abroad, that the Unitarian arrives at a full understanding of the dignity and responsibility of his profession. What enterprise can a human being propose to himself so morally preëminent as that of promoting a liberal interpretation of Christianity and perfect freedom of religious inquiry? How much of fidelity, of earnestness, of self-possession, of

self-sacrifice is imperiously demanded by such a position! The grandeur of this design is perceptible abroad, where, on every side the barriers of ignorance and superstition obscure a religion intended by its beneficent Author to be expanded, like the air and light of heaven over the universe—to minister to the spirit of man,—to solace it when weary and sorrowing, illumine and cheer its darkness, develope its moral being—and waft it to its God.

If there be a religious faith fitted from its very nature to sustain human virtue when unsupported by every other aid, to keep clear and elevated the eye of faith when those who were wont to direct its gaze are absent, and to preserve undimmed the fire of devotion in the wanderer's heart—it is that of the Unitarian. Thus is he confirmed abroad in this world, and such may he humbly anticipate will be the testimony of the more spiritual manifestations of his eternal home.

H. T. Tuckerman.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

---

The Editor of the Unitarian readily admits the following remarks of a correspondent upon a debateable subject. The length of the letter has induced the Editor to omit those parts of it which comment particular upon the "Reviewer's" account of the trial of Kneeland, and some other small portions; deeming it sufficient to present his correspondent's views upon the main principle on which the prosecution was founded, and the substance of his reasoning and illustrations. It will be perceived that the writer of the letter is an Englishman, of whose respectable character we are fully assured. It is well for us to gather wisdom from comparing with our own the views of intelligent men, somewhat differently situated from ourselves in regard to civil and ecclesiastical polity.

In looking over the Unitarian, for July, at page 346, I met with an anonymous review of Mr. Dunlap's speech in the Municipal Court, in defence of Abner Kneeland on an indictment for blasphemy; and "Arguments of the Attorney of the Commonwealth in the trials of Abner Kneeland for Blasphemy." I have ever been in the habit of identifying Unitarian Christianity with every thing liberal in sentiment, candid in argument, and generous in practice. Professing to be guided by the wise, and pure, and benevolent doctrines and precepts of the gospel of the blessed God, I have thought, but I may mistake, and if so I trust I shall be pardoned, that it was the first and great desire of Unitarian Christians in their unavoidable conflicts with them that oppose the truth as it is in Jesus, whether misbelievers or unbelievers, not to be overcome of evil;

but to overcome evil with good: that they had such undoubted confidence in the truth, stability, and power of pure and undefiled religion, as to reject with honest indignation, the *puny* aid of the civil law in its defence.

The reviewer speaks of "obscene and vulgar blasphemy," and seemingly takes for granted, that it ought to be punished. Are we then to infer, that *chaste* and *polite* blasphemy are to escape with impunity? The reviewer has unfortunately omitted to favour his readers with the definition of the term blasphemy. He tells us that the "counsel for the prosecution has shown most satisfactorily that blasphemy has a meaning." How easily, then, might he have enlightened us on a subject of vast and serious consequence, and thus prevented some at least, who in the simplicity and integrity of their hearts make it a point of conscience, to think what they speak, and speak what they think, from falling into like condemnation! As the case now stands no one is safe from the fangs of the law; no one at least that considers it a sacred duty to bear his honest testimony in favour of what he conceives to be the truth. For if the Attorney for the Commonwealth be justified in prosecuting for what he may be pleased to call blasphemy, in one, he is in every instance. And then who can be safe?

Christians of conflicting sentiments, to their very great reproach it must be acknowledged, have been long in the habit of charging each other with the crime of blasphemy! How easy then would it be for a reputedly Orthodox attorney for the Commonwealth, full of fiery flaming zeal for his peculiarism, to construe every opinion in religion but his own *ism* to mean, "obscene and vulgar blasphemy," and prosecute and cause to be fined and imprisoned, every one that does not subscribe to his creed: such things have happened before now, and can you, will you be certain, that they will never happen again? Will not the same causes produce the same effects? So long therefore as the right of prosecuting for blasphemy continues to be recognised, such things will recur, and the foul stigma on the lovely face of true religion remain unobliterated. Perhaps, however, the learned counsel and his reviewer mean nothing more than that the blasphemy punishable by law, consists in speaking and writing contemptuously of revealed religion. I would crave the liberty of asking those gentlemen one question. If you are Orthodox must you not act on precisely the same principles towards the anti-orthodox, and if Unitarian towards the Orthodox? However greatly we may esteem virtuous but mistaken men, we cannot, while we retain a proper sense of the importance of truth, feel any respect whatever for their errors. Now the infidel or unbeliever professes to regard religion not simply as an error; but as a gross imposition. In his endeavours therefore to disabuse his fellow-men, can you expect him to employ measured and respectful language in describing what if sincere, he must utterly disapprove and abhor? If he uses arguments, answer him with arguments. If he employ "rigmarole" and "flummery" to use the language of the reviewer, then treat the matter with perfect silence as unworthy your notice: and do not by rendering evil for evil, countenance your adversary in saying, that you are conscious of the utter defencelessness of your system on their ground of fair and manly argument; and that recklessly determined, from sinister motives, to defend a bad cause, you employ fines and dungeons, when argument fails. Besides, who authorized you to punish for blasphemy? It may indeed be legal; but is it evangelical, is it according to the mind that was in Christ Jesus? Hear, I beseech you what Tacitus a heathen says, "Deorum injuriæ Diis curæ." *Leave to the gods the revenge of their own wrongs.* Now listen to two eminent and liberally minded Christians, the Rev. Robert Aspland, and Dr. Furneaux. The former says in allusion to the subject: "This is the spirit of Christianity, and there is great wisdom in such a recommendation of the forbearance of power. In the case before us, punishment is unnecessary, for blasphemy excites unmingled horror in society, and is the antidote to its own poison. It is attributed at once to athe-

ism or madness, which is nearly the same. The report of it makes every one fly for safety to the settled principles of his understanding, and the habitual feelings of his heart. There is only one way of lessening the general abhorrence of blasphemy, and that is, by punishing it vindictively; for then the sufferer may excite sympathy, and sympathy may grow into a foolish admiration of his fortitude and spirit. It is a fact, and altogether consonant to human nature, that in those times and places where the laws against blasphemy have been most severe, and executed with the greatest rigour, there has been the most and worst blasphemy." De Furneaux in his letters to Blackstone observes: "Though calumny and slander, when affecting our fellow-men, are punishable by law; for this plain reason, because an injury is done and damage sustained, and reparation therefore due to the injured party; yet, this reason cannot hold where God and the Redeemer are concerned, who can sustain no injury from low malice and scurrilous invective; nor can any reparation be made to them by temporal penalties; for these can work no conviction or repentance in the mind of the offender; and if he continue impenitent and incorrigible, he will receive his condign punishment in the final retribution."

All men if possible should be made sensible of the folly and iniquity of that system so unblushingly advocated by modern unbelievers, but this must be effected by no other means under heaven, than fair argument and friendly persuasion. For my own part I would not hurt a single hair of the head of the most vulgar opposer of divine revelation; and as a Christian I hesitate not to say, if genuine religion cannot be supported on the ground of its own intrinsic merits, but must be propped up by fines and dungeons, the sooner it falls to the ground the better: the world will then be rid of what is utterly unworthy its regard. But what is meant by "religious tolerance." As an English nonconformist I have regarded and still do regard the phrase with the utmost abhorrence, because it appears to me that the right to tolerate necessarily implies the right to be intolerant! To speak then of "religious tolerance," is about as wise and reasonable as to talk of *breathing* tolerance. The truth of the matter is, the power to breathe and the power to be free are alike the precious gifts of the benevolent Creator. For he that hath made breathing indispensable to our physical existence, hath in like manner made freedom essential to our moral and intellectual being.

The reviewer tells us, "they (Kneeland's followers) really are a band of ignorant and deluded, not to say, immoral men." Ignorance and delusion, are misfortunes, not necessarily crimes; immorality is indisputably sinful. But were there laws to punish immorality none would escape; not, because I think all or even a majority of mankind are immoral. No, I have a better opinion of society; but because on the subject of morality, there is a great diversity of opinion, so that each in his turn would be implicated. Immorality then, sinful as it unquestionably is, so long as it does not materially interfere with and disturb the peace of society may not be punished by human laws. It is wise therefore to leave it to the Judge of all the earth, who will do right.

Besides, will prosecutions for blasphemy dissipate ignorance, banish delusion, and inspire moral and virtuous feeling? Will not such proceedings tend rather to confirm the ignorant and impious, cause them to cling closer to their leader and his pernicious sentiments, and regard him as a martyr, and themselves a proscribed and persecuted sect? And, have we yet to learn, that it is in the nature of persecution to defeat its own ends, to build up what it intended to pull down? The artful leaders of those ignorant and deluded people, are wise in their generation; they are fully aware of the value of persecution to their demoralizing cause. To employ a common but not inapt saying, they know it brings grist to their mill; hence they do every thing in their power to provoke persecution. If therefore you feel a desire to indulge those worthies, to exalt their infatuated parti-

sans in their own estimation, to enlist public sympathy in their favour, and give extensive circulation to their gross, indecent, and vulgar attacks on all that is sacred, and amiable, and good; only institute a few more prosecutions for blasphemy, and you will do more to propagate and extend infidel principles in six months, than they could accomplish in a generation. Let them alone is good and sage advice; their counsel, their work being evidently human and corrupt, will inevitably moulder, decay, and vanish before the radiant glory of the sun of righteousness.

But we are told "they are discontented with all the existing principles upon which the social system is maintained, and eager to bring about a total change in all the institutions of society." Are they so? Well, this may be sufficient evidence of their ignorance and delusion; but the remedy for this unhappy state of things is not to be sought for in the execution of unjust and merciless laws; but in ardent, untiring, and affectionate endeavours to enlighten their minds, meliorate their condition, and inspire them with right views of the dignity of their nature, as the image and offspring of God who is love, and the exalted destination of his obedient children. Let the wealthy, the learned, and the influential Christian, condescend to men of low estate, provide efficient means for instructing the ignorant, reclaiming the vicious, and employing the idle; let him patronize the industrious and reward the meritorious; cheered by the conviction that what he is doing for the least of these brethren, Christ will regard as done for himself. It is because the poor are too often overlooked by the rich and influential, and suffered to languish in ignorance, self degradation and moral wretchedness, that they become envious and discontented. Rescue them from a state of self degradation, not by fines and dungeons, but by kindness and benevolence; exalt them to the dignity of moral and rational beings; let them feel that you sympathize with them, that you are taking a lively interest in their improvement and welfare, and envy and discontent will vanish; you will be greeted by smiling, happy countenances, will enjoy the approbation of conscience and of God, and secure the blessing of them that were ready to perish. But should discontent still exist, it will be found only in the haunts of the irreclaimably vicious. At all events, discontent is not an offence against human laws, nor is it a crime that I know of to manifest even an "eager" desire to remove its real or supposed cause, provided always it be attempted in a peaceable and constitutional manner. It were well, were the laws wise enough to prevent, at any rate they ought always to be strong enough to punish, all violence and outrage.

These remarks would be inconcomplete, were the closing paragraph overlooked. If this may be considered any thing like a fair specimen of the learned counsel's "arguments," they may be safely pronounced unworthy the name. In truth, this specimen paragraph is not a particle superior to the ravings of those wild fanatics called revivalists; and seems admirably calculated to produce a similar effect. It is in short a violent and inflammatory appeal to the strong passions of the jurors, designed to rouse their fears and excite their terror, by conjuring up a number of the most fantastic and hideous phantoms, and causing them to flit in rapid and terrific succession before the highly excited imagination of the gentlemen of the jury. Such for example, *as open, gross, palpable, indecent blasphemy, Fanny Wright system, atheism, community of property, unlimited lasciviousness, adultery, infidelity, marriages dissolved, prostitution made easy and safe, moral and religious restraints removed, the foundations of society broken up, property made common, and universal mischief and misery!* Here then is an array of ghastly spectres, sufficient in all conscience to frighten all the good old ladies, and young ones too, not only in Boston, but throughout the United States. Could any one seriously believe that those phantoms existed any where but in the prolific brains of the ingenious and learned counsel for the prosecution, and perchance in those of his reviewer also; he must conclude Boston, staid, pious Boston, the city of the Pilgrim Fathers; is a second Sodom! with this difference

however, that in the former, not even ten righteous persons could be found, and hence was destroyed by a mighty overthrow; but Boston still remains, and owes its safety under God, not indeed to the officiousness of them who by an unjustifiable measure dragged an obscure individual into light, who before was scarcely known beyond the precincts of the city, and, but for this unfortunate prosecution, might have lived and died in obscurity. No, but to its many virtuous, benevolent, and philanthropic citizens, who would be an honour and safeguard to any city. Grace and peace be multiplied to them. In sober truth, I feel persuaded that the groundless fears of some good Christians have magnified the number and strength of unbelievers, far, very far, beyond their actual amount, to their own terror and dismay; but to the high gratification of the rejectors of divine revelation; who must feel themselves not a little flattered by a concession, which I verily believe has no foundation in truth. I am too well acquainted with the favourite notes which bigots and fanatics are so fond of chaunting, to be either charmed or frightened by them. They seem never better pleased than when they are bawling out at the very top of their lungs; the church is in danger, infidelity is on the increase. It is by this craft they have their wealth. Let not then, serious, enlightened, and liberal Christians fear where no fear is; but trusting in God, and true to themselves, they may rest assured, that the word of Jehovah which is gone forth out of his mouth, shall not return to him void, but shall accomplish his pleasure, and prosper in the thing whereto he hath sent it.

I have only to say by way of conclusion, that I have no personal acquaintance whatever, with the writer of the article which has occasioned these remarks; nor with any of the parties, directly nor indirectly concerned in this prosecution. These observations therefore, are not, if I know my own heart, dictated by prejudice or partiality; but by love for true religion and rational freedom, and from the desire here to record my humble but fearless protest against attempts, by whomsoever made, to uphold our holy religion by the STRONG ARM OF THE LAW.

M. HARDING.

*Fryeburg, July* 10, 1834.

---

THIRD LETTER TO THE REV. ADIN BALLOU.

*Harvard, August* 8, 1834.

DEAR SIR,

You say, "I am willing to concede that there are no passages of Scripture, which declare in so many unequivocal words:—*all men will finally be restored to holiness and happiness.* But I contend that there are several striking passages which necessarily involve this meaning, and which cannot be explained consistently with the rules of just exegesis, without recognising the truth of our doctrine. You quote three passages from St. Paul, "who," you say, "as the apostle of the Gentiles, would of all others be most likely to inculcate this doctrine." And after making your quotations, you add, "If these passages do not involve the doctrine of universal restoration, I grant it is not declared in the Bible."

You select your first passages from Col. i. 19, 20. "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." What does this passage mean? I think it means that Christ was endued with all those honours, gifts, and virtues which would in every way qualify him for his important offices; that God by his son Jesus, made overtures of peace to his sinful and rebellious offspring; and that by this same Jesus

he grants to all, both Jews and Gentiles, the privilege and the means of returning to their heavenly Father by penitence, by faith, and holy obedience. The passage speaks of things which are often spoken of in the New Testament, viz: the love of the Father, the glorious and excellent character of the Saviour, and the gracious and merciful designs of the gospel. I think it means that God has through Christ, made ample provision for the salvation of all men, who are disposed to comply with the requisitions of the gospel. It is mournfully evident that all do not thus comply in this state of being: and that those who die impenitent, will, in another world, be furnished with effectual means of grace, and become certainly holy and happy, seems not to me a necessary inference. The father makes overtures of peace to his children; but they are disregarded by many. They are invited and besought to become reconciled to him. He desires not the death of the sinner; but many sinners turn a deaf ear to the merciful voice that calls them to peace and reconciliation. The context I think shows that the apostle did not mean by this passage to teach that all men would certainly be restored to holiness and happiness. For he says, "And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled, in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy, and unblameable, and unreprovable, in his sight; if ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven."

Though you had been sinful, yet he has granted you the means of reconciliation, or the privileges of the gospel—and he has done this that he may present you holy, and unblameable, and irreprovable in his sight, *if you continue in the faith, grounded and* settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel. I need not tell you that the same word does not always mean the same thing; and that the literal meaning of words and expressions is not always the true one. Paul addresses the Colossians, as being already *reconciled*—i. e. the gospel had been made known to them, and they had begun to submit to its authority and instruction; but their being found holy, unblameable, and unreprovable depended on their continuance in the faith: and that they would continue thus was not absolutely certain. For myself I see not that the word *reconcile* in this passage "necessarily involves the meaning," that all men will be finally restored to holiness and happiness. I know not how great stress you lay on the expression *all things*—and *whether they be things in earth or things in heaven.* With my views of the various senses in which the word *reconcile* may be understood, it is not of so much importance to determine whether the expression *all things* means every individual being, that ever did, and ever will exist, or not. Since, according to my views, all may be reconciled, i. e. enjoy the means of reconciliation, and yet not be reconciled, i. e. they may not all faithfully employ those means so that they become holy and happy. I suppose you would readily admit that *all* and *every* are not always to be understood in their most comprehensive significations. Paul speaking of the gospel, says, "which ye have heard, and which was preached to *every creature that is under heaven.*" There were probably thousands and millions who had never heard a syllable of it.

Your second passage is Philip. ii. 9–11. "Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." But why must we infer from this passage that all men will be finally restored to holiness and happiness? You ask what it means? I think that the most it necessarily means is this, that all should be brought to an acknowledgment of the dignity, and to a subjection to the authority of Christ.—And this I suppose may be done, though all do not become holy and happy. Though every knee were made to bow, and every tongue to confess, yet

it does not say that all would pay him the willing homage and obedience of the heart. Many are under the dominion of earthly sovereigns, and show them much outward respect while they are at heart opposed to them. Because that all will ultimately be constrained to own and reverence God and Christ, I do not think it necessarily follows that all must become good.

When the apostle wrote this passage, he is thought to have had in his mind this passage of Isaiah, which I will give in Mr. Noyes' translation, xlv. 23, 24.—"That to me every knee shall bow; that to me every tongue shall swear. 'Only in Jehovah,' shall men say, 'is salvation and strength: *to him shall come and be put to shame all that are incensed against him.*'" So that though all may be brought into his presence, all do not appear there with the same character and feelings.

Your third passage is from 1 Cor. xv. 28. "And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him, that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." My brother, does this text involve the meaning that all men will be finally restored to holiness and happiness? To me, having "all things *subdued* unto him," does not seem to imply that all will become holy and happy. The apostle had said just before, "For he must reign till he hath *put all enemies under his feet.*" He does not say, nor, as I think, leave us to infer that all these enemies will become true and faithful friends. He mentions their being put *under his feet—not seated at his right hand!* After we have said that the text means that the time is coming when all shall be brought into subjection to Christ, either willingly, or unwillingly, and that when this complete ascendency is gained, the Son will resign his dominion to God who gave it to him;—after we have said this, I think we have no good authority to say that the passage means more.

I have thus endeavoured to show you, Sir, what I thought was the meaning of these three passages. I have thought that in attempting to explain any single passage of Scripture, the rules of just exegesis would require us to examine not barely the passage as it stands alone, but as it stands connected with the whole treatise. Paul has written a number of epistles; other apostles have also written; and they all wrote concerning Christianity. Their knowledge of Christianity was, in various ways derived from Christ, many of whose discourses and sayings were recorded, and are transmitted to us. We should remember these things when we endeavour to fix upon the true meaning of any particular sentence. As it stands alone, it may seem to teach what it was never designed to teach. I saw this passage quoted to prove that repentance was not necessary, in order to salvation, "*For the gifts and callings of God are without repentance.*" You believe in a future righteous retribution. You believe that such a doctrine is often recognised and often taught in the Bible. So do I. Why should the other doctrine, viz. the final restoration of all to holiness and happiness, if it is so important to the moral character of God,—why should it be so passed over in silence, without being once declared in so many unequivocal words? you profess to regard the doctrine as essentially a necessary influence—first from several very remarkable texts, three of which you quote—and secondly, from the fundamental truths of divine revelation, which, you say, cannot be carried out harmoniously to any other result. If all your remarkable passages of Scripture are similar, in their language and import, to those you have adduced, I cannot agree with you in thinking that your peculiar doctrine is a necessary inference from them.

You think that the goodness, the love, the benevolence, and the paternal character of God, discountenance and disprove the doctrine that any will be eternally miserable. My dear friend, it does seem to be a sad thought, that any should be left in such a doleful and hopeless condition! We know that there is much evil in this world, and yet we firmly believe that God is wise and good. An earthly parent may be good and benevo-

lent. He may love his children; he may constantly seek to promote their happiness; and yet they may be vicious and miserable. Is it limiting the holy one of Israel to think that he cannot make us happy contrary to our will and choice? Is not holiness the result of our own efforts co-operating with divine influences? God has placed us in circumstances where we may certainly become holy. He furnishes us with all proper and needful means and helps. If we do not become holy, does it prove that God is not good? In speaking or thinking of future punishment or misery I endeavour to have these truths fresh in my mind, viz. that God will do no wrong to any of his creatures—and nothing inconsistent with his wisdom, justice and benevolence—that the misery of the wicked will not exceed their real unworthiness. Here I suppose you would agree with me.

Our main difference then seems to be, not about the *sum* or *amount* of future misery, but about its *duration*. How then does your doctrine exhibit the character of God as more benevolent and amiable? According to the supposition, the sinner has in either case, just the same quantity of misery to endure. Just as much as you *limit* its *duration*, just so much you *increase* its *intensity*. Since the Scriptures speak so plainly of a future state of retribution, and are so silent about a state of probation beyond the grave; I must confess that I feel not authorized as yet to teach such a doctrine, nor to infer it from other gospel truths. I have supposed that, if the doctrine of the final restoration of all men to holiness and happiness were true, and of such great practical importance to us in this world, it would have been more distinctly and clearly revealed—that such a prominent place would have been given to it, that it could be easily discovered. I have much more to say to you on this interesting subject, but I must defer it to another opportunity. I know not that I have, as yet, used a harsh or unkind expression; if I have, or if I do, you will have the frankness to tell me so. That we may both earnestly, and candidly contend for the faith once delivered unto the saints, is the prayer of your friend and brother. JONATHAN FARR.

REV. ADIN BALLOU.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE UNITARIAN.

*Boston, Angust 11th*, 1834.

DEAR SIR,

LAST Sunday evening, I attended at Park street, to hear the Rev. Dr. Beecher, who has just come hither from the West, to make an appeal for the Lane Seminary. In the course of his remarks, he burst out into violent anathemas against the Catholics; and one part of his charge, was, that the Pope denied that protestant ordinances were valid, "and thus, said the Doctor, he "endeavoured to bastardize all Europe." This was one of the main-stays of his violent crusade against popery.

It happened that the very day before, I read an article in the "New York Observer" headed "*Baptism by Unitarians not valid*," which conveyed the *unanimous* decision of that "General Assembly" to which Dr. Beecher has been (after great opposition, on account of his heresies) at last admitted a member.

The article deserves consideration. The paper in which it is published is one of the principal religious periodicals in the United States, having a circulation but a little short of 14,000. I give the article abbreviated.

"*Baptism by Unitarians not valid.*

"*Editors of the N. Y. Observer,*—As some difficulty has occured relative to admission of persons coming from Unitarian societies into Evangelical churches, I send you the following extract from the *Assembly's Digest.* A person baptized by Dr. Priestley applied for admission to the Lord's Table. The question was, 'shall Dr. Priestley's baptism be considered valid.' The Assembly adopted the following Resolution:

"'*Resolved,* That this question be answered in the *negative:* and it was accordingly determined in the negative. In the present state of our country, while Unitarian errors are making their insidious approaches; whilst the advocates of this heresy are insinuating themselves into the confidence of multitudes,' (you see Mr. Editor we are rapidly gaining ground) 'who have no suspicion of their defection from the faith, the Assembly feel it their duty to speak without reserve.

"It is the deliberate and UNANIMOUS opinion of this Assembly, that those who renounce the fundamental doctrine of the Trinity, and deny that Jesus Christ is the *same in substance,* equal in power and glory with the Father, CANNOT BE RECOGNISED AS MINISTERS OF THE GOSPEL *and that their ministrations are wholly invalid.*'"

To show how far this distinction goes, I have just received information from Louisville by letter, that at the celebration of the fourth of July by the children of all the Sunday Schools in that town, the pupils of the Unitarian and Catholic Schools were expressly excluded, because they were not Christians. The Presbyterian minister made this division between pagans and believers.

Now, Sir, is not here the very essence of bigotry? Is not this as bad as the worst form of popery? Is not Presbyterian popery, and Dr. Beecher's popery, as bad as any popery the world ever saw?

With nothing of the venerableness of antiquity to recommend it, without the strong arm of a union with the state to enforce its arrogant encroachments upon the rights of man, without even any general unity of sentiment to justify its own vaunted infallibility, what is there in Calvinistic popery, that is not to be despised, condemned, and resisted above all the intolerance of popes and cardinals? H.

---

We have been obliged, in order to give the concluding part of some important articles, and to do justice to our Correspondents, to omit in the present number, Notices of Books.